

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejected Claims 7-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action also rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants have amended Claims 7, 16, 17, and 18.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-6 and 25-28. Applicants have also added Claims 29-33. Accordingly, Claims 7-24 and 29-33 are now pending. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 7-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected Claims 7-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 7, 16, 17, and 18 to more specifically indicate that a single policy is applied to all e-mail transmitted between the internal network and the external networks. The term "first policy" refers to the single policy applied to all e-mail messages processed by the system. From the use of this term, it is clear that a single overriding policy is applied to all e-mail messages handled by the recited methods and systems. Therefore, the term "first policy" is specific and definite. Hence, Claims 7-24 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, in view of Applicants' canceling of Claims 25-28, remaining Claims 7-24 are allowable.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield, US Patent No. 5,632,011, Bruce Schneier: Applied Cryptography 2nd Edition, Oct. 1995, John Wiley & Sons Pub. and Aziz, U.S. Patent 5,416,842. Although Applicants disagree with the office action that Claims 1-6 are obvious in view of the prior art, Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-6.

New claims 29-33

Applicants have added new Claims 29-33. The new claims are directed to an attachment processing feature of a policy filtering system of the invention. The new claims are fully supported by the specification as filed and therefore contain no new matter. For example, reference to requiring signature attachment for secure

communication of e-mail messages is found on Page 12, second paragraph. Therefore, no new matter is added by new Claims 29-33.

SUMMARY

In view of the forgoing supporting remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of pending Claims 7-24 and 29-33. This application is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

If the Examiner wishes to direct any questions concerning this application to the undersigned Applicants' representative, please call the number indicated below.

Dated: September 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Perry
Reg. No. 46,194

Attorney for Applicant
(212) 735-3000
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Four Times Square
New York, NY 10036